1	Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.300(d), Leap Wireless International, Inc. is		
2	required to file and serve its state court Notice of Related Cases, attached hereto as Exhibit A, in		
3	this related action.		
4	Dated: June 19, 2008	Respectfully submitted,	
5 6		LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg Pamela S. Palmer	
7		Kimberly Arouh Hicks Jake Ryan	
8		Curtis Carll Daniel K. Greene	
9		Ry s/Kimherly Arouh Hicks	
10		By s/ Kimberly Arouh Hicks Kimberly Arouh Hicks Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.	
11		Leap Wireless International, Inc. kimberly.hicks@lw.com	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22 23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1

PROOF OF SERVICE

2 3

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is Latham & Watkins LLP, 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800, San Diego, CA 92101-3375.

4

On June 19, 2008, I served the following document described as:

5

NOMINAL DEFENDANT LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL. INC.'S NOTICE OF RELATED CASES FILED IN STATE COURT

6

by serving a true copy of the above-described document in the following manner:

7

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

9

I am familiar with the United States District Court, Southern District of California's practice for collecting and processing electronic filings. Under that practice, documents are electronically filed with the court. The court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in the case. The NEF will

10

constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user constitutes consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said practice, the following

11

CM/ECF users were served:

12

Edward M. Gergosian, Esq. GERGOSIAN & GRALEWSKI LLP

13

655 West Broadway, Suite 1410 San Diego, CA 92101

14

ed@gergosian.com

15

Attorneys for Plaintiff

16

Keith E. Eggleton, Esq.

Diane M. Walters, Esq.

17

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI APC

650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304

19

18

Tel: 650-493-9300

Fax: 650-493-6811

20

email: keggleton@wsgr.com email: dwalters@wsgr.com

Attorneys for Individual Defendants

22

23

21

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of, or permitted to practice before, this Court at whose direction the service was made and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

24

Executed on June 19, 2008, at San Diego, California.

25

26

27

28

Andrea Rasco

EXHIBIT A

Notice of Related Cases

Pursuant to California Rules of Court 3.300 (c), Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. ("Leap") hereby gives notice to the Court and all interested parties that the above captioned state derivative case is related to: (1) pending federal derivative and securities cases, and (2) dismissed cases.

A. Related Pending Federal Derivative And Securities Cases

This case, Lori McBride, Derivatively on Behalf of Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, and Michael B. Targoff, and Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc., filed February 7, 2008 (hereinafter the "Leap State Derivative Litigation"), is related to the following pending federal cases:

- 1. The federal derivative case pending in the United States District Court of the Southern District of California, before the Honorable Barry T. Moskowitz: Charles Graham, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, Amin Khalifa, Grant Burton, Dean M. Luvisa, Michael B. Targoff, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, Mark H. Rachesky, M.D., and James D. Dondero and Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc., Case No. 08cv0246 BTM (NLS), filed February 7, 2008 (hereinafter the "Leap Federal Derivative Litigation").
- 2. The consolidated securities class action case pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, before the Honorable Barry T. Moskowitz: HCL Partners Limited Partnership v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., S. Douglas Hutcheson, Dean M. Luvisa, Amin I. Khalifa, and PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP, Lead Case No. 07cv2245 BTM (NLS), filed November 27, 2007, and Kent Carmichael v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, Amin I. Khalifa and Dean M. Luvisa, Case No. 08cv128 (hereinafter collectively the "Leap Securities Litigation").

B. Related Dismissed Cases

The Leap State Derivative Litigation is also related to the following three dismissed cases—one state derivative action and two federal securities class actions (collectively the "Dismissed Cases"):

- 1. Charles Graham, Derivatively on Behalf of Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc. v. S. Douglas Hutcheson, et al., Superior Court of California for the County of San Diego Case No. 37-2008-00075341-CU-MC-CTL, filed on January 9, 2008 and subsequently dismissed. Derivative plaintiff Graham refiled his action in this Court on February 7, 2008 and it is the Leap Derivative Litigation.
- 2. Frank Charek v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., et al., United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 07CV2256DMS(CAB), filed November 28, 2007 and subsequently dismissed.
- 3. Devay Campbell v. Leap Wireless International, Inc., et al., United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 07CV2297BTM(NLS), filed December 7, 2007 and subsequently dismissed.

C. Description Of The Manner In Which The Cases Are Related

Pursuant to California Rules of Court 3.300 (a), an action or proceeding is related to another action or proceeding where both of them: (1) involve the same parties and are based on the same or similar claims; (2) arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events requiring the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact; (3) involve claims against, title to, possession of, or damages to the same property; or (4) are likely for other reasons to require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.

1. The Leap State Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Federal Derivative Litigation.

The state and federal derivative litigation meet each of the factors identified above for related cases. First, they both involve substantially overlapping parties—Leap and several of

its current and former officers and directors, including S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta, and Michael Targoff. Second, they both arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events – Leap's financial restatements for the period 2004 to 2007 that was announced in November 2007, and allegations of the defendants' knowledge regarding the accounting errors and alleged deficiencies in internal controls in the four years prior to such announcement. Further, both the state and federal cases will require the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact, including but not limited to the threshold issue of shareholder standing to bring the claims derivatively. Third, both the state and federal derivative action involve the same claims, including but not limited to breach of fiduciary duty claims. Fourth, both the state and federal derivative action will require substantial duplication of judicial resources if heard by different judges.

Due to the overlapping nature of the *Leap State Derivative Litigation* and the *Leap Federal Derivative Litigation*, Leap will move to stay this state action until the parallel federal action is resolved.

2. The Leap State Derivative Litigation is also related to the Leap Securities Litigation

The Leap State Derivative Litigation and the Leap Securities Litigation also meet each of the factors identified above for related cases. First, they both involve substantially overlapping parties—Leap and several of its current and former officers and directors. Second, they both arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, incidents, or events—including a restatement of Leap's financial statements for the period 2004 to 2007, as announced on November 9, 2007, and the individual defendants' alleged knowledge of the accounting errors underlying such restatements and alleged lack of internal controls. Further, the Leap State

Derivative Litigation and the Leap Securities Litigation Leap will require the determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law or fact, including legal issues pertaining to the scope of discovery and factual issues such as whether the alleged errors violate GAAP, when

1	the defendants became aware of the alleged errors, and whether the defendants traded on		
2	material adverse information. Third, both the Leap State Derivative Litigation and the Leap		
3	Securities Litigation are likely to require substantial duplication of judicial resources and risk		
4	inconsistent rulings if heard by different judges on a variety of issues, including discovery issues,		
5	factual issues, and issues pertaining to the extent of the automatic discovery stay under the		
6	Private Securities Litigation Reform Act when, as here, a motion to dismiss a securities claim is		
7	pending. The Southern District of California has already determined that the Leap Federal		
8	Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Securities Litigation, and for the same reasons, this		
9	Court should similarly find the Leap State Derivative Litigation is related to the Leap Securities		
10	Litigation.		
11	3. The Leap State Derivative Litigation is also related to the Dismissed		
12	Cases		
13	For the reasons discussed above, the Leap State Derivative Litigation is also		
14	related to the dismissed state derivative action and the dismissed federal securities actions.		
15			
16	Dated: June 1, 2008 Respectfully submitted,		
17	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg		
18	Pamela S. Palmer Kimberly Arouh Hicks		
19	Curtis Carll Daniel K. Greene		
20			
21	By Kimberly Arouh Hicks		
22	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	4		

1			
2	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP Miles N. Ruthberg (Bar No. 086742) miles.ruthberg@lw.com		
3	Pamela S. Palmer (Bar No. 107590) pamela.palmer@lw.com		
4	355 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071		
5	Telephone: +1.213.485.1234 Facsimile: +1.213.891.8763		
6	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP		
7	Kimberly Arouh Hicks (Bar No. 163285) kimberly.hicks@lw.com Curtis Carll (Bar No. 248470)		
8	curtis.carli@lw.com Daniel K. Greene (Bar No. 253595)		
9	daniel.greene@lw.com 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800		
10	San Diego, California 92101-3375 Telephone: +1.619.236.1234		
11	Facsimile: +1.619.696.7419		
12	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Leap Wireless International, Inc.		
13	,		
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF T	HE STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA
15	COUNTY C	F SAN DIEGO	
16	LODINGDDDD D : : I D I IS S		
16 17	LORI MCBRIDE, Derivatively on Behalf of Leap Wireless International, Inc.,	CASE NO. 37-200	07-00081584-CU-MC-CTL
	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS
17	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v.	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF
17 18	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H.	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES
17 18 19 20	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19 20 21	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California corporation,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Leap Wireless International, Inc., Plaintiff, v. S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK H. RACHESKY, JAMES D. DONDERO, JOHN D. HARKEY, JR., ROBERT V. LaPENTA, MICHAEL B. TARGOFF, Defendants, - and - LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California corporation,	CASE NO. 37-200 PROOF OF SER DEFENDANT LI INTERNATION RELATED CASI Judge: Dept.:	VICE OF NOMINAL EAP WIRELESS AL, INC.'S NOTICE OF ES Hon. John S. Meyer

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is Latham & Watkins LLP, 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800, San Diego, California 92101-3375.

On June 19, 2008, I served the following documents described as:

NOMINAL DEFENDANT LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S NOTICE OF RELATED CASE

by serving a true copy of the above-described document in the following manner:

	By Federal Express. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and processing packages for delivery by FedEx, which practice is that when packages are deposited with the Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for depositing packages with FedEx, such packages are picked up by a representative of FedEx that same day in the ordinary course of business.
	By E-Service. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for preparing and serving documents by e-mail, which practice is that when documents are to be served by e-mail, they are scanned in a .pdf format and sent to the addressees on that same day in the ordinary course of business.
	By Facsimile. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting, processing, and transmitting facsimiles. Under that practice, when a facsimile is deposited with the Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for facsimiles, such facsimile is transmitted that same day in the ordinary course of business.
×	By U.S. Mail. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and processing documents for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under that practice, documents are deposited with the Latham & Watkins personnel responsible for depositing with the United States Postal Service; such documents are delivered to the United States Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of business, with postage thereon fully prepaid in a sealed envelope.
	By Hand Delivery. I am readily familiar with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and processing documents for hand delivery by a messenger service or a registered process server. Under that practice, documents are given to the messenger service or registered process server for the delivery of documents by hand in accordance with the instructions provided to the messenger service or registered process server; such documents are delivered to the messenger service or registered process server on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I caused a sealed envelope or package containing the above-described document(s) and addressed as set forth below in accordance with the office practice of Latham & Watkins for collecting and processing documents for hand delivery by a messenger service or a registered process server.
×	By Electronic Filing. I am readily familiar with the United States District Court, Southern District of California's practice for collecting and processing electronic filings. Under that practice, documents are electronically filed with the court. The court's CM/ECF system will generate a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the filing party, the assigned judge, and any registered users in the case. The NEF will constitute service of the document. Registration as a CM/ECF user constitutes consent to electronic service through the court's transmission facilities. Under said practice, the following CM/ECF users were served:

The documents were served on the following parties in the above captioned action and the pending related cases:

3

1

2

4	Leap State Derivative Litigation		
	Jeff S. Westerman, Esq.	Attorneys for Plaintiff Lori McBride	
5	Elizabeth P. Lin, Esq.		
6	MILBERG LLP		
0	300 South Grand Ave., Suite 3900		
7	Los Angeles, CA 90071		
	Tel: 213-617-1200		
8	Fax: 213-617-1975		
9	email: jwesterman@milberg.com		
9	email: elin@milberg.com		
0	(Via U.S. Mail)		
1	Anita Kartalopoulos, Esq.		
	Kent A. Bronson, Esq.		
2	MILBERG LLP		
3	One Pennsylvania Plaza		
,	New York, NY 10119		
↓	Tel: 212-594-5300		
	Fax: 212-868-1229		
;	email: akartalopoulos@milbergweiss.com		
	email: kbronson@milbergweiss.com		
, II	(Via U.S. Mail)		
·			
	Bruce G. Murphy, Esq.		
3	LAW OFFICES OF BRUCE G. MURPHY		
)	265 Llwyds Lane		
	Vero Beach, FL 32963		
1	Tel: 772-231-4202 Fax: 772-231-7222		
	email: bgm@brucemurphy.biz		
	(Via U.S. Mail)		

2223

24

25

26

27

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Keith E. Eggleton, Esq. Diane M. Walters, Esq. WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI APC 650 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304 Tel: 650-493-9300 Fax: 650-493-6811 email: keggleton@wsgr.com email: dwalters@wsgr.com (Via U.S. Mail)	Attorneys for Individual Defendants S. Douglas Hutcheson, Mark H. Rachesky, James D. Dondero, John D. Harkey, Jr., Robert V. LaPenta and Michael B. Targoff
	Leap Securities	Litigation
8 9 10 11 12	Lionel Z. Glancy GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 201-9150 Facsimile: (310) 201-9160 email: info@glancylaw.com (Via Electronic Filing)	Attorneys for Plaintiff HCL Partners Limited Partnership and Lead Plaintiff New Jersey Carpenter Pension Benefits Fund
13141516	Lori Sambol Brody, Esq. KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 1801 Century Park East, Suite 1460 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 785-0893 / Fax: (310) 785-0897 email: lbrody@kaplanfox.com (Via Electronic Filing)	Attorneys for Plaintiff Kent Carmichael
17 18 19 20 21	Kirk Hulett, Esq. Blake M. Harper HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP 550 West C Street, Suite 1600 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 338-1133 / Fax: (619) 338-1139 email: kbh@hulettharper.com email: bmh@hulettharper.com (Via Electronic Filing)	Attorneys for Movant Westchester Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment Management L.L.C.
23 24	Nicole Lavallee BERMAN DeVALERIO PEASE TABACCO BURT PUCILLO 425 California Street Suite 2100	Attorneys for Movant Louisiana Municipal Police Employees Retirement System
25 26	San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 433-3200/Fax: (415) 433-6382 email: nlavallee@bermanesq.com	
26 27	(Via Electronic Filing)	

1	Christopher Lometti, Esq.	Attorneys for Movant Jersey
2	Jay P. Saltzman, Esq. Ashley Kim, Esq.	Carpenters Pension and Benefits Fund
_	Daniel B. Rehns, Esq.	
3	SCHOENGOLD SPORN LAITMAN &	
4	LOMETTI 19 Fulton Street, Suite 406	
7	New York, New York 10038	
5	Tel: 212-964-0046	
6	email: <u>chris@spornlaw.com</u> email: <u>jay@spornlaw.com</u>	
U	(Via Electronic Filing)	
7		
8	Ramzi Abadou	Attorney for Movant Alaska Electrical
Ū	COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN AND ROBBINS	Pension Fund and Genesee County Employees' Retirement System
9	655 West Broadway, Suite 1900	Employees Retirement System
10	San Diego, CA 92101	
	(619)231-1058 email: ramzia@csgrr.com	
11	(Via Electronic Filing)	
12	Leap Federal Derivat	ive Litigation
13	Edward M. Gergosian, Esq.	Attorneys for Plaintiff Charles
13	GERGOSIAN & GRÁLEWSKI LLP	Graham
14	655 West Broadway, Suite 1410 San Diego, CA 92101	
15	E-mail: ed@gergosian.com	
13	(Via Electronic Filing)	
16	Keith E. Eggleton, Esq.	Attorneys for Individual Defendants
17	Diane M. Walters, Esq.	1 Individual Describerty
	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI	
18	APC	
19	650 Page Mill Road	
	Palo Alto, CA 94304	
20	Tel: 650-493-9300	
21	Fax: 650-493-6811	
22	email: keggleton@wsgr.com email: dwalters@wsgr.com	
22	(Via Electronic Filing)	
23		
24	I will also cause the above referenced do cases.	cument to be filed in the pending related
24	I declare that I am employed in the office	e of a member of the Bar of, or permitted
25	to practice before, this Court at whose direction the serv	vice was made and declare under negative
26	of perjury under the laws of the State of California that	the foregoing is true and correct.
20	Executed on June 19, 2008, at San Diego, California.	
27		
28	Andrea Rasco	
20		I Marca Rasco
1	4	